UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA INDIANAPOLIS DIVISION

CARDINAL SQUARE, LLC an Indiana Limited Liability Company,)
Plaintiff,)
v.) No. 1:23-cv-00114-JRS-MJD
QBE SPECIALTY INSURANCE COMPANY a North Dakota Corporation,))
Defendant.)))
LG ELECTRONICS U.S.A. INC., SEA, LTD,	
Interested Parties.))

Order on Discovery Dispute

This is an insurance coverage dispute arising from lightning strike damage to a Muncie apartment building. Here, though, the Court addresses a discovery dispute. QBE subpoenaed interested parties LG Electronics and SEA for a settlement agreement and expert reports that came from a prior lawsuit between Cardinal Square and LG. Magistrate Judge Dinsmore denied, (ECF No. 101), LG's motion to quash, and LG appeals. Now before the Court is LG's Emergency Motion to Stay Magistrate Order, (ECF No. 109), and its Rule 72 Objection to Magistrate Order, (ECF No. 110).

The Court will examine the Order in question, (ECF No. 101), and "modify or set aside any part of the order that is clearly erroneous or is contrary to law." Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a). "The clear error standard means that the district court can overturn

the magistrate judge's ruling only if the district court is left with the definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been made." Weeks v. Samsung Heavy Indus. Co., 126 F.3d 926, 943 (7th Cir. 1997).

The Court finds no error in the Magistrate Judge's ruling.

LG relies heavily on White-Rodgers v. Kindle, 925 N.E.2d 406 (Ind. Ct. App. 2010), for its position that expert work product is protected in subsequent litigation. White-Rodgers happens to be irrelevant: it is an Indiana Court of Appeals case interpreting Indiana trial rules—this is a federal court, where the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure apply. Even if it were relevant, it deals with a different scenario than that presented here. White-Rodgers dealt with the disclosure of a consulting expert's work in ongoing litigation between two parties. Here we have expert work product from a different suit between different parties. The Magistrate Judge correctly states the rule: "Documents prepared for one who is not a party to the present suit are wholly unprotected by Rule 26(b)(3) even though the person may be a party to a closely related lawsuit in which he will be disadvantaged if he must disclose in the present suit." Wright & Miller, 8 Fed. Prac. & Proc. Civ. § 2024 (3d ed.).

LG's argument against producing the settlement agreement is also weak. LG argues the Magistrate Judge misweighed the relevance and burden of producing the settlement agreement. It is not generally a reviewing Court's job to reweigh factual determinations. Even so, the Court sees nothing inappropriate in the Magistrate Judge's assessment of the situation: the settlement of the prior lawsuit has some bearing on the claims at issue here. That is true even if the settlement includes

extraneous matters. The burden of producing a single document is trivial. And there is a protective order available if LG wants to retain its confidentiality.

The Magistrate Judge's Order, (ECF No. 101), stands; the Court finds no clear error; LG's Motions, (ECF Nos. 109, 110), are **denied.**

SO ORDERED.

Date: 10/04/2023

JAMES R. SWEENEY II, JUDGE United States District Court Southern District of Indiana

Distribution:

Magistrate Judge Dinsmore

Drew L Block Plunkett Cooney dblock@plunkettcooney.com

Jennifer M Busby Burr & Forman LLP gbusby@burr.com

Russ Campbell Balch & Bingham rcampbell@balch.com

Danielle Rose Chidiac Plunkett Cooney dchidiac@plunkettcooney.com

Dina M. Cox LEWIS WAGNER, LLP dcox@lewiswagner.com

Jason R. Delk DELK MCNALLY LLP delk@delkmcnally.com Ryan Hodinka BALCH & BINGHAM LLP rhodinka@balch.com

Joshua LaBar Plunkett Cooney jlabar@plunkettcooney.com

Bradford Schane Moyer PLUNKETT COONEY (Indianapolis) bmoyer@plunkettcooney.com

Kenneth C. Newa PLUNKETT COONEY, PC knewa@plunkettcooney.com

Pamela A. Paige Plunkett Cooney, P.C. ppaige@plunkettcooney.com

Sean W. Shirley Balch & Bingham LLP sshirley@balch.com